



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,050	09/19/2000	Mark Anderson	MBHB00,648	5666
20306	7590	10/21/2004	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			PARTON, KEVIN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/665,050	ANDERSON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kevin Parton	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2004.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-9 and 15-18 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 10-14 and 19-24 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 07/26/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the following reasons and the grounds of rejection below.
2. On page 9, paragraphs 2-3, the applicant argues that the reference to Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teaches the selection of applications and not the selection of service providers from a plurality of service providers. However, the applicant's definition of a service provider is not included in the current claims. The reference teaches the selection of applications from a plurality of applications. Each of these applications provides a service, as such; they can be referred to as a plurality of service providers.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642).

5. Regarding claim 1, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach a system for automatically configuring a client device for communication with a service provider with means for:

- a. Selecting a service provider by a user on the client device, wherein the user selects the service provider from a plurality of service providers (column 5, lines 31-33).
- b. Entering user information data on the client device, wherein the user information data can be used by one of the plurality of service providers to create configuration data for the client device used to configure the client device to access the service provider (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11). Please note that a login script is created for access to the service provider.
- c. Accessing the service provider by the client device and providing user information data to the service provider (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, figure 14b).
- d. Receiving configuration data from the service provider (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, figure 14b).
- e. Configuring the client device based on the configuration data (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11).

6. Regarding claim 2, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the user

information data comprises user identification data and user location data (column 5, line 65-column 6, line 12).

7. Regarding claim 4, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teaches all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein a format for the user information data is the same for each of the plurality of service providers (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, figure 14b).

8. Regarding claim 5, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein accessing the service provider comprises accessing a server associated with the service provider (abstract; column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, figure 14b).

9. Regarding claim 7, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the configuration data comprises server data, communication data, and user login data (column 5, line 65-column 6, line 12).

10. Regarding claim 9, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means for storing in a memory unit of the client device the configuration information (figure 14b; column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3).

11. Regarding claim 15, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach a system for automatically configuring a client device for communication with a service provider with means to:

- a. Query a user for a service provider, wherein the client device is arranged to provide a user with an ability to select one of a plurality of service providers (column 5, lines 31-33).
- b. Query the user for user information data (column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 12).
- c. Send the user information data to the service provider selected by the user wherein the user information can be used by one of the plurality of the service providers to create configuration data used to configure the client device (column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 12; column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11).
- d. Receive the configuration data from the service provider selected by the user (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, figure 14b).
- e. Use the received configuration data to configure internal application (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11)
- f. Establish a communication session with the service provider selected by the user (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11). Note that login configuration for services is included.
- g. The plurality of service providers in communication with the client device, each service provider arranged to create the

configuration data upon receipt of the user information data, based on the user information data and send the configuration data to the client device (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11). Note that configuration information for any service can be sent.

12. Regarding claim 16, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 15. They further teach means wherein the client device is arranged to send the user information data to one of the plurality of service providers in a first data structure, and the plurality of service providers is further arranged to send the configuration data to the client in the first data structure (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11).

13. Regarding claim 18, Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 16. They further teach means wherein the plurality of service providers is arranged to communicate in the first data structure (column 6, lines 31-37, 58-59; figure 3, elements 85, 87; figure 14b; column 7, lines 7-11).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642).

16. Regarding claim 6, although the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) (as applied to claim 5) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein accessing the server associated with the service provider comprises a URL query.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and it would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) by employing a URL to access the service providers. This benefits the system because it allows maintenance to take place via a browser which is not platform specific.

17. Claims 3, 8, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) in view of Young (USPN 6,477,522).

18. Regarding claim 3, although the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the user information data comprises an XML stream.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642), as evidenced by Young (USPN 6,560,606).

In an analogous art, Young (USPN 6,560,606) discloses a system for configuration of network devices wherein configuration information is sent using an XML data stream (column 10, lines 4-14).

Given the teaching of Young (USPN 6,560,606), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) by employing the use of XML to send user information data. This benefits the system because XML is a flexible standard that can be utilized by a wide range of network accessible devices without major customization.

19. Regarding claim 8, although the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the configuration data comprises an XML stream.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642), as evidenced by Young (USPN 6,560,606).

In an analogous art, Young (USPN 6,560,606) discloses a system for configuration of network devices wherein configuration information is sent using an XML data stream (column 10, lines 4-14).

Given the teaching of Young (USPN 6,560,606), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) by employing the use of XML to send configuration data. This benefits the system because XML is a flexible standard that can be utilized by a wide range of network accessible devices without major customization.

20. Regarding claim 17, although the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) (as applied to claim 15) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the first data structure is an XML data structure.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642), as evidenced by Young (USPN 6,560,606).

In an analogous art, Young (USPN 6,560,606) discloses a system for configuration of network devices wherein the first data structure is an XML data structure (column 10, lines 4-14).

Given the teaching of Young (USPN 6,560,606), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bourke-Dunphy et al. (USPN 6,449,642) by employing the use of XML to send user information data. This benefits the system because XML is a flexible standard that can be utilized by a wide range of network accessible devices without major customization.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

21. Claims 10-14 and 19-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin Parton  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2153

ksp



Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner